Rio Puerco Resource Management Plan Schedule and Budget

Budget and Schedule
How did we get there?

- Each member of the ID Team used a data needs table for estimation of work months, data gaps, equipment and contract needs
- Copious amounts of discussion
- Some networking with other resource specialists and offices with like issues.

PREPARATION PLAN DATA NEEDS

Resource or Use: **Soil, Water, and Air Program elements**
Unit: **Entire Planning Area**

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Planning Question	**Needed Data Set(s)**	**Data Set(s) Available? (Yes/No/Partially)**	**Proposed Remedy for Data Gaps**	**Estimated Costs ($$ or WMs)**	**Are FGDC Metadata Available?**	**Name/Source of Data Standard**	**Does Data Available Meet Nat'l or Reg'l Std.?**	**Name/Source of Potential Nat'l/Reg'l Standard**
What are the characteristics of soil resources in the planning area?	Soil survey data (NRCS national data server "Soil Data Mart")	Yes (NRCS, spatial)		4 WM	Yes	National Cooperative Soil Survey	Yes	
What actions and use restrictions are needed to protect, maintain, or improve the quality of the soil resources and watershed values associated with the public lands, including natural site productivity	BLM Rangeland Health Assessments	Partial? (non-spatial)				BLM standard	Yes	
	"Reasonable Foreseeable Development" from "Resource Uses" (e.g. energy/minerals)	During RMP development						
What are the characteristics of water resources and uses in the planning area?	BLM Water Use Inventory	Yes (non-spatial)		4 WM		BLM standard	Yes	
	BLM Riparian Assessments	Yes (non-spatial)				BLM standard	Yes	
	BLM Rangeland Health assessm't.	Partial? (non-spatial)				BLM standard	Yes	
	Other water summaries (e.g. from Regional Water Plans)	Yes (non-spatial)						
	Stream gage records (USGS)	Yes (non-spatial)				USGS standard		
What actions and use restrictions are needed to protect, maintain, or improve the quality of the water resources and watershed values associated with the public lands, including surface and ground water quality, quantity, and timing.	Water quality (USGS, NMED)	Yes (non-spatial)				USEPA standard		
	Water quality standards (NMED)	Yes (non-spatial)				USEPA standard		
	Adjudication areas (OSE)	Yes (spatial)			Yes	NM OSE		
	Aquifers (OSE)	Yes (spatial)			Yes	NM OSE		
	Ground/surface basins (OSE)	Yes (spatial)	None- we will use best available data		Yes	NM OSE		
	Water rights/claims (OSE)	Partial (non-spatial)				OSE "WATERS" database		
	"Reasonable Foreseeable Development" from "Resource Uses" (e.g. energy/minerals)	During RMP development						
	Watersheds, HUC 8/10/12 digit	Yes (spatial)			Yes	USGS / NRCS	Yes	
	State impaired streams	Yes (spatial)			Yes	NM Env. Dept.	Yes	
What are the characteristics of air resources in the planning area?	Ambient air quality information.	Yes (non-spatial)				USEPA, NMED		
	Air quality standards.	Yes (non-spatial)		$50,000		NRCS, NOAA		

TABLE I

BUDGET SUMMARY

Budgeted Item or Activity	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	Project Total
Labor						
Workmonths	59	142	137	103	48	489
Workmonth Cost (@ $6,000 per WM)	354,000	852,000	822,000	618,000	288,000	2,934,000
Labor Total						**2,934,000**
Contracts						
Writer-Editor		20,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	50,000
Minerals (Potential Report)		150,000				150,000
(RFD)		46,000				46,000
Transportation		117,000				117,000
Cultural (Class I Overview)		50,000				50,000
(Partial Inventory)		30,000				30,000
(Check Ojito Trails)		30,000				30,000
Social & Economic Features		80,000	75,000			155,000
Forestry		40,000				40,000
Contracts Total		563,000	85,000	10,000	10,000	**668,000**
Services						
Printing			15,000	15,000	15,000	45,000
Notices		1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	4,000
Meeting Rooms		2,000	2,000			4,000
Services Total		3,000	18,000	16,000	16,000	**53,000**
Equipment & Supplies						
GPS		20,000				20,000
GIS		20,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	35,000
Equipment & Supplies Total		40,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	**55,000**
Non-Labor Total		606,000	108,000	31,000	31,000	**776,000**
Grand Total						**3,710,000**

Schedule from Preparation Plan

- Because of the size and format of the schedule, a hand-out is used in the presentation.

Budget Impacts

- Change in budget appropriations from SO/WO
- Continuing resolutions
- Change in personnel and/or schedule
  - Schedule delays, time is money
- In-house procurement or software platforms
  - FBMS
  - ePlanning
- Thieves in the night

Schedule Impediments

- Policy and data gap changes
- Personnel changes
  - Range con, archaeologist, wildlife biologist, GIS, geologist/mining, writer-editor
- Management changes
  - 4 managers since start of project
- Budget changes
  - Almost any change here will impact schedule

Lessons Learned

- Use network of existing Plans and Planners to find the cost in time and money for each task
- Keep management aware of impediments to progress in schedule or budget problems
- Ask management for help
- Develop contingency plans and be flexible in methods to achieve goals
- Know the strengths and weaknesses of ID Team and adjust accordingly

If you want to reduce the schedule and budget of your next RMP

- The next 3 slides come from the 20 year evaluation of the Rio Puerco Resource Management Plan
- The start of a new plan revision is only as good as the old plan implementation when concerning schedule and budget

Lessons learned from Plan Evaluation

- Actions outlined in the plan are being implemented, however a number of resource specialist felt the rate of implementation was less than acceptable.
- Implementation is strongly influenced by funding and staffing and other priorities.
- Implementation is also influenced by increased interest and involvement by outside interest groups in resource management decisions.
- This can sometimes affect the implementation of decisions which in turn affects the Rio Puerco's management direction and taxes staff productivity.
- The pace at which most decisions are made (i.e., "crisis management mode") is antithetical to good planning/environmental analysis.

Lessons learned from Plan Evaluation 2

- The RMP is being used in decision-making.
- Most of the specialists felt that the actions being implemented by BLM and for the public are in conformance with the RMP.
- However, few EAs are being tiered to the document and little or no monitoring of projects is being done to see that they conform with stipulations in the EA and with those in the RMP.

More lessons learned from Plan Evaluation 3

- For the various resources in the existing plan, some of the goals, standards and objectives are not present or clearly stated.
- At the time the RMP was prepared, there was no supplemental program guidance to guide the preparation of the document.
- Some decisions, OHV designations being one of the most salient, are outdated and need to be brought into conformance with current policy.
- There are strong management objectives for the ACEC's, as shown in the Special Management Areas Section of the plan.

For more information

Joe Blackmon
Rio Puerco, RMP Team Lead
435 Montano NE
ABQ, NM 87107
505 761 8918
Joe_Blackmon@blm.gov